

## The Sun.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1894.

Subscription by Mail Post-Paid.

|                            |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| DAILY, Per Month           | 50 Cts |
| DAILY, Per Year            | 5.00   |
| SUNDAY, Per Year           | 5.00   |
| DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year | 10.00  |
| WEEKLY, Per Year           | 1.00   |

Postage to Foreign Countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

Subscriptions in Advance by the American Express Company at any place where that Company has an agency. Agents will give a money order receipt for subscriptions, and will forward the money order attached to an order to send the paper for any stated time, free of any charge except the usual fee for forwarding the order.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Local News.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the United Press and New York Associated Press is at 21 to 23 N. 9th street. All information for the press should be sent to this office.

## Plain Facts for Democrats.

The anti-Democratic, anti-Administration wave of public sentiment that started in Rhode Island last April has reached Georgia. It has swept over every State in which the citizens have had a chance to get at the ballot box, with results hereinafter noted.

State elections have been held in eight States, in the order mentioned, namely, Rhode Island, Oregon, Tennessee, Alabama, Arkansas, Vermont, Maine, and Georgia. These Commonwealths are widely separated, both geographically and by political conditions. There is nothing uniform save the Democratic wherever the votes are counted.

Rhode Island, having given a Democratic plurality of 185 in 1893, goes Republican in 1894 by more than 6,000. Oregon, which elected its present Governor, as a Democrat, by 5,000 plurality, goes Republican by about 7,000. Tennessee, Democratic for Governor in 1892 by 27,000 plurality in spite of an Independent-Democratic movement which drew off 80,000 votes from the regular candidate, is Democratic yet, but with the plurality of two years ago cut just in half. Alabama, the home of Democratic majorities of from 50,000 to more than 100,000, is saved this year with hardly more than 20,000 to spare. Arkansas, 40,000 Democratic for CLEVELAND in 1892, goes down to 25,000 or thereabouts. Vermont, Republican by 14,000 at the face of the election, a Governor, and the Republican majority this year. Maine falls in line with the heaviest Republican majority within the memory of the present generation, a majority greater even than GRANT's over GREELEY, twenty-two years ago, and more than double HARRISON's over CLEVELAND in 1892. And now comes Georgia, which went Democratic in 1892 by 81,000 and in 1890 by 105,000, with a vote so close that the party managers would be happy this morning to claim with certainty a beggarly 20,000 in that former stronghold of Democracy.

What does it all mean? It means that the drift is all one way. It means that the people of the United States are getting their first opportunity to record their verdict of Good or Bad on the second Administration of GROVER CLEVELAND. It means that Bad is having it by a large majority.

Yet in the face of this tremendous wave of adverse popular sentiment, saving its edge perhaps for a crushing defeat in November, the fact remains that Democracy is still alive; God preserve it from its enemies within and without!

## Wednesday's Election in Georgia.

The Democratic lead in Georgia, the Empire State of the South, as it was formerly called, appears to have been cut down five-sixths at Wednesday's election. There were large Democratic losses; there were large Populist gains. A reduced Democratic and an increased Populist representation in Congress from Georgia is foreshadowed as the result of this week's voting.

A reduced Democratic majority in Georgia? Why is this? Various explanations are offered. The Chairman of the Democratic Campaign Committee attributes it to the low price of cotton. Another Democrat of distinction attributes it to the high standard of independence disclosed by the colored voters of Georgia as soon as it became manifest that the Democrats were short of funds. Another man, a Republican, attributes it to the failure of the Hon. H. H. SMITH to make more speeches. Those he did make for the Democratic candidate made votes for the Populist.

The well-known Republican leader, the Hon. Secretary of the Interior had spoken often for the Democrats, the Populists would have carried Georgia. Nor are other reasons, some sound, some specious, some absurd, lacking by way of explanation.

It is always easy to give plausible reasons for a political reverse, but the fact remains, whatever the cause of it, that the Democrats of Georgia sustained a substantial and humiliating calamity on Wednesday. The Populists are in high feather, confident, exultant, and even defiant over the gains which they achieved. Why attribute to the price of cotton, an important matter, or the foolishness of H. H. SMITH, an insignificant personage, a result, the reason for which is as plain as a pikestaff?

When the Democrats in Congress adopted the odious income tax as an article of Democratic political faith, they elevated to importance the Populist party, which makes an assault on the legal accumulations of wealth to be its foundation stone, starting point, inspiration, and essence. By this act they took away from every Democrat in Georgia the power to confront and confound the Populists, whose pet project the Democrats have made their own. This humiliating concession warranted further Populist demands. "You have agreed to our Populist income tax, why not to our other Populist notions, free silver, railroads built and run by the State, the Government to find work for the unemployed and to loan money on crops, land for the people, and copartnership of employees in the holdings of their employers: why not agree to these?" they said to the Democrats of Georgia.

Thus, from this simple but sinister starting point, a dangerous menace to Democratic success in Georgia was brought into the canvass, and the ordinary weapons of argumentative defence against Populism were taken away from the Democrats. It is easier to start a fire, usually, than to put out; and so the Democrats of Georgia found themselves on Wednesday.

The first victory won by the Populists of Georgia over the Democrats of Georgia was achieved in Washington, when a Democratic Congress adopted the Populist income tax. A second victory, enlarging the range and influence of the first, was won by the Popu-

lists when a President elected by Democrats on a Democratic platform failed to veto the income tax. The returns from Georgia merely complement and supplement work already done in Washington. They are, so to speak, its mathematical corroboration, its inevitable sequence.

## Mexico and Guatemala.

We have news of the sending of a considerable body of Mexican troops to the southern frontier, preparatory to the defence of that region against Guatemala, which is charged with encroaching upon the territory of Mexico. The boundary dispute there is of long standing, and it has recently been intensified by the incursions of gangs of Guatemalan woodcutters upon soil claimed by Mexico. We are not prepared to say which party has the right of the quarrel; but the Mexican Government has given notice of its determination to retain possession of the valuable forests which have been under its jurisdiction for many years.

A war between the two republics must be especially harmful to Mexico, even if it were to end in the Mexican conquest of Guatemala. After a half century of turbulence and civil war, Mexico has had a period of peace under President DIAZ, and she has made very good use of the time. The Government has been constitutionally conducted; the relations between the Federal and State authorities have been much improved; the hostility of the rival parties to each other has greatly decreased; the resources of the country have been developed; the credit of the Treasury has been strengthened; there has been a remarkable extension of commerce; very important public works have been projected or completed; and Congress has had the opportunity of attending to other business than that of war. Mexico has been quieter and more progressive under DIAZ than it had been at any other time since the formation of the republic. It certainly was in need of repose.

In the breaking of this repose, and in the stirring up again of the ill-gotten spirit of the Mexican people, there is very great danger to Mexico. The elements of civil discord still exist there, and the manifestation of them is prevented only through the constant exercise of military power by the President. Less than two years ago bands of rebels were in the field near the American border, and there is reason to fear that like bands will again be seen in case the Government shall be involved in a foreign war. That would be a very bad thing for Mexico and for Mexican interests.

Guatemala is a petty power as compared with Mexico; but there is not a country anywhere that has more bellicose inhabitants. It is only for short periods of time that they ever stop fighting, either among themselves or against their neighbors. We have no doubt that Mexico will be able to reduce them, if left free to do so; but Mexico's most serious peril, in the case of hostilities abroad, is within her own bounds.

The immediate purpose for which a Cabinet Council was convened on Thursday is indicated by the orders subsequently issued by the Admiralty and the Secretary of State for India. The London newspapers were all wrong in attributing the meeting of the British Ministers to a threatening demonstration on the part of France, or to the rumored design of the French to enforce and emphasize their protectorate over the Hovas in Madagascar. It was the interests of Great Britain in the East that caused the Cabinet Council, but precisely how those interests are supposed to be menaced is a matter for inference from the movements announced. Is it simply the lives and property of British residents in Chinese treaty ports that Lord ROSEBURY's Government recognizes the duty of protecting? Or is a contingency foreseen in which it would decide to interpose on one side or the other of the quarrel between China and Japan?

The Secretary justifies the assumption that England has nothing to fear from the Chinese, the shielding of her subjects sojourning in China from depredation and assault. Japan is understood to have agreed not to molest Shanghai, and she has thus far made no sign of an intention to attack any of the other treaty ports in China. The sole danger, therefore, to which British residents in those places are known as yet to be exposed must come from the inability of the Chinese local authorities to maintain order. But there are already a considerable number of British war ships cruising in Chinese waters, and one would think that these might spare a sufficient force of marines and bluejackets to assure the safety of their fellow countrymen in the treaty ports. The object, at all events, would be amply secured by the 6,000 soldiers which the Cabinet Council is said to have authorized the Secretary for India to dispatch from Calcutta.

This measure being entirely adequate to the only avowed aim, what can have been the secret ground for the extraordinary and seemingly superfluous orders issued by the Admiralty? Why is it that not only a number of cruisers and gunboats have been directed to proceed forthwith to China, but the headquarters of the whole Channel fleet have been transferred from Portsmouth to Gibraltar? The last-named move affords conclusive proof that, for the moment at least, nothing is apprehended on the part of France; what it renders obvious is the intention to make the fleet hitherto employed in the Mediterranean available, if needed, for operations in Chinese waters. In a word, the British naval force under Admiral FREDMANTLE on the eastern Asiatic station is to be at once nearly doubled, and to receive prospectively such great additions as would make it overwhelmingly superior to any maritime opponent. What, then, is the contingency, entirely outside of the easy protection of some thousands of British subjects, which is contemplated by the Admiralty? Does the British Government apprehend a swift and successful advance of the Japanese upon Peking, and the consequent ruin of the present Manchu dynasty, followed, perhaps, by a dissolution of the Chinese empire? Does it consider that its interests in India imperatively require it to uphold the unity of the Middle Kingdom as being a factor essential to the balance of power in Asia? Or has it learned of an arrangement whereby Russia is to obtain Port Lazareff, either with the connivance of Japan or at the instigation of China?

It would not be easy to reconcile the assumption of Japanese connivance in such a plan with the now confirmed report of the landing of 5,000 Japanese soldiers in the extreme northeast of Corea, between Port Lazareff and the Russian frontier. No less difficult is it to understand what Russia would have to gain by a diversion which would hamstring the Japanese operations, seeing that her Asiatic policy, apparently, would be best served by a complete collapse of Chinese dignity and power.

We need light upon the real attitude of Russia toward Japan and China at this time in order to comprehend the strange course taken by the British Cabinet Council. Meanwhile, it is better not to let theories and surmises outstrip known facts.

The present Congress has thus far neglected to provide by law for the adequate support of our fellow citizens holding office abroad as Ambassadors of the United States. Strong reasons, why the salaries of the Ambassadors should be raised, and houses maintained for our diplomatic representatives in such capitals as London, Paris, and Berlin. To all that we have said on this subject we are now able to add the distinct and conclusive testimony of the Hon. THOMAS F. BAYARD, our distinguished and universally esteemed Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain. In an interview in London with a correspondent of the New York Herald, Mr. BAYARD remarked:

"I need not disguise from you the fact, as I shall not disguise it from my countrymen later on, that the present salary attaching to this post, in itself, hardly sufficient to enable an occupant to bear himself with the dignity becoming the representative of a great nation. For myself, of course, I don't complain, nor shall I publicly refer to the matter until my term of office is ended.

"I shall then most probably, however, urge on the Government and my countrymen the advisability of providing for my successor and his successors in their official houses in the same manner as I have done in this. This would relieve the Ambassador of considerable expense, and at the same time would have a beneficial effect in other ways. At times it is incumbent on the official representative of America, in England to give vent to his own views on the subject of the tariff, and this would partake of a more official character and the guests there would probably feel more at home if they were held in a building which, through the Government, would be directly under the control of the American nation.

"Mind you, in all this I am speaking in the most un- official and general manner, and only because the subject has been once referred to in the American press in no ambiguous terms."

time in order to comprehend the strange course taken by the British Cabinet Council. Meanwhile, it is better not to let theories and surmises outstrip known facts.

## Mr. Bayard on Ambassadors' Salaries.

The present Congress has thus far neglected to provide by law for the adequate support of our fellow citizens holding office abroad as Ambassadors of the United States. Strong reasons, why the salaries of the Ambassadors should be raised, and houses maintained for our diplomatic representatives in such capitals as London, Paris, and Berlin. To all that we have said on this subject we are now able to add the distinct and conclusive testimony of the Hon. THOMAS F. BAYARD, our distinguished and universally esteemed Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain. In an interview in London with a correspondent of the New York Herald, Mr. BAYARD remarked:

"I need not disguise from you the fact, as I shall not disguise it from my countrymen later on, that the present salary attaching to this post, in itself, hardly sufficient to enable an occupant to bear himself with the dignity becoming the representative of a great nation. For myself, of course, I don't complain, nor shall I publicly refer to the matter until my term of office is ended.

"I shall then most probably, however, urge on the Government and my countrymen the advisability of providing for my successor and his successors in their official houses in the same manner as I have done in this. This would relieve the Ambassador of considerable expense, and at the same time would have a beneficial effect in other ways. At times it is incumbent on the official representative of America, in England to give vent to his own views on the subject of the tariff, and this would partake of a more official character and the guests there would probably feel more at home if they were held in a building which, through the Government, would be directly under the control of the American nation.

"Mind you, in all this I am speaking in the most un- official and general manner, and only because the subject has been once referred to in the American press in no ambiguous terms."

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

There must be no more victims. Congress, at the very next session, should raise the salaries of our principal Ambassadors to at least \$35,000 a year, and provide suitable residences for them in London, Paris, and Berlin. This should be done without waiting until Mr. BAYARD's successor is appointed, and Mr. BAYARD himself should be sent back from England, a poorer man, although not less widely esteemed and honored than when he went abroad.

## Will the President of the Park Board Hold a Friendly Conference with Himself?

We claim, for a moment, the attention of Mr. CLAUSEN, the President of the Park Board, and invite his consideration of a certain aspect of himself which is at present a tediousness in the public eye.

No one will belittle the importance of our system of parks, or the intimate and warm personal regard in which it is held by all our citizens. Mr. CLAUSEN, merely, as we believe, by mischance, was made a trustee of that great public interest, and had confidence to him one of the most honorable responsibilities that it is in the power of the city of New York to confer. To be selected as a Commissioner of our public parks is a civic and public distinction of no common order. The natural theory of the choice implies that it falls upon men who deserve well of their fellow citizens, who are fitted for a public trust, and who by education and condition of life are qualified to well and duly discharge the special duties of park management.

A Park Commissioner is therefore certified to the community as a man who will bring probity, artistic cultivation, peculiar good taste, and good sense to the execution of a task which calls for the exhibition of those qualities. In truth, to express it briefly, if a Park Commissioner is a gentleman that fact will not be held against him.

Now when a Park Commissioner has, however unconsciously, forced home upon the public the conviction that there is grave question of his probity, none at all of his plentiful lack of cultivation, and no reasonable ground for suspecting him of good taste or good sense, his continued occupancy of the office entails disagreeable consequences. He is himself conscious of no discomfort, the very causes of his disabilities making him insensible to public distrust, contempt, or reprobatation. But with the public it is very different. People look with comparative indifference upon a grovelling man, but they are not so ready to forgive him when he is much too blame to forgive; but when they will show any apathy where it is a question of the safety of their parks.

If Mr. CLAUSEN's stock of prudence is in any degree compensatory for his lack of other things, he will, as we have suggested, deeply meditate this aspect of his personal circumstances. Mr. CLAUSEN cannot fail to appreciate our frankness when we tell him that he has placed himself in a dangerous position and had better recede from it, if there is yet time. Had a person of honesty, cultivation, good taste, and good sense, unwittingly or by accident—which is a violent hypothesis—so involved himself as Mr. CLAUSEN has done, there would remain open to him the not undignified and entirely decent alternative of resignation. But Mr. CLAUSEN—

This is a time in which all the European countries desirous of the maintenance of peace may well join in the Russian cry, "Life to the Czar." The whole world knows of the pacific disposition of ALEXANDER III; it has yet to know of the disposition of the heir apparent. If he be warlike, our globe may tremble before the end of the century.

There ought to be an awful warning to burglars in those pictures of faded burglers, or of manacled or fugitive burglers, to which objection is made by the Woman's C. T. Union. There is a great moral lesson to the wicked in these fading works of pictorial art. Again, there is an unfortunate instruction in horsemanship, hunting, and rifle practice in those polychromatic pictures of daring cowboys to which objection is made by the anti-militarist little matron who is President of the W. C. T. U. As to the condemnation picture of shooting affairs, they may be ethical, or otherwise, according to circumstances. For example, the picture of the shooting affair between SAM HORTON and SANTA ANNA at San Jacinto would not be considered indecent by any Texas. Again, the picture of that memorable affray which was painted by the celebrated French artist Goussier, for which the late Mr. A. T. STEWART paid \$20,000 francs, is not of an immoral nature, would not be likely to lead any young slacker to

imitate the conduct of the gladiators. We could tell of lots of other pictures of affrays which have a tendency to promote virtue.

The members of the Woman's C. T. Union must be discriminative in their criticism of the works of art which appear upon the billboards. They cannot expect that all of them shall be pictures of bleeding lambs, or cooling doves, or modest virgins, or infants in the pretty cradle.

The Democratic investment in the Populists' income tax does not seem to have been any more profitable in Georgia than it was in Maine.

Why should not all applicants for papers of naturalization in this city be required to make answer to the English question, not through an interpreter? Would not the courts of New York be justified in refusing to naturalize any alien who does not understand the speech of the country, or is unable to read its Constitution in the language in which it was originally written?

There is a FITZSIMMONS-CORRETT case in the chess world also. The champion of that form of intellectual warfare, LASKER, defeated STREINZ some months ago. The game, however, went to show that STREINZ, when STREINZ was still a greater player than LASKER. Within a week after that affair the old champion challenged LASKER to a return match, and apparently the challenge was accepted; but now we learn, through the London Daily News, that LASKER, who is in London, will certainly not play again with STREINZ until some time about the "autumn of 1895," more than a year from now. This is a ridiculously non-sporting attitude for LASKER to assume, and altogether inadmissible under the rules of his place. The chess champion, as well as the pugilistic champion, has no right to put himself in a storehouse for a year in order to avoid playing a match. The STREINZ-LASKER match should eventually before CORRETT meets FITZSIMMONS.

## HILL THE ONLY HOPE.

A Long Range but Clear-Highway Survey of the New York Situation.

From the Election News.

It will doubtless be seen when all the facts bearing on the nomination of David B. Hill for Governor by the Democracy of New York are developed that the event was predetermined as the only logical and politic result of a strenuous and implacable campaign. Mr. HILL's career in the United States Senate, brief as it has so far been, was found to mark him as an unexpectedly conservative on the currency question involved in the repeal of the Sherman Silver Purchase law and on the discriminating and unequal income tax asked by the Wilson Tariff bill. In relation to this income tax measure his conservative opposition was especially emphatic and inflexible. His position thus defined as a sound money man and as the foremost champion in Congress of the claims of invested capital to have its fruits and its income restored to it secure against exceptional taxation of thrift commended him to the acceptance of the substantial and enterprising elements of New York in a degree which scarcely any other possible nominee of his party could have commanded. His nomination in view of its antecedents and circumstances, however, was not without its own significance, however, in denoting the depth of the chasm between Eastern Democrats and Western and Southern Democrats which the national Democracy, as the next Presidential election approaches, will have to consider and deal with. The following is part of a statement adopted by the Democratic Convention at Saratoga:

We commend the efforts made by the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State to avert the imposition of the present income tax, and we endorse our right to the reform on the tariff, which we believe is the only one that can be effected by enacting on its provisions a direct tax to which many Democrats were strenuously opposed.

On its face this language is moderate. Its true accentuation is to be found in the enthusiastic endorsement and acclamatory nomination of David B. Hill, who has been elected to the tax in itself and to the combined spirit of populism, socialism, and communism which he holds to underlie it.

Southern and Western Democratic Senators and Representatives who gleefully fancied some of the things that they could do to the national Democratic platform and appropriate this piece of Populist lumber as a bait for uncounted Populists without endangering the integrity of the party or its prospects of success in 1896, will now proceed to open their ponderous lids and enlighten their feebly cross-eyed vision. The bill called attention to the fact that there was in their own platform no demand for or suggestion of such a measure. It was pointed out that it had no precedent in this country except in a piece of Republican legislation which was condemned by public sentiment generally and by Democratic sentiment especially. It was shown that the new piece of party legislation was singularly obnoxious to the traditional Democratic doctrine of equal rights for all and of neither unequal burdens nor unequal immunities for any. Senator Hill, in combating the measure, had called attention to the fact that this doctrine to the last ditch, chiefly because of his course in this matter the nomination for Governor at the hands of the Democracy of New York irrevocably devolved upon him by force. It would seem, of the moral and logical necessity of the case. One leading Democratic politician, however, who had been nominated because the chances of the party to win the State have been greatly if not fatally lessened. The income tax law chiefly did it. The only hope of saving New York was seen in the man who had the courage to take and maintain an uncompromising stand against a measure of such a nature.

There must be no more victims. Congress, at the very next session, should raise the salaries of our principal Ambassadors to at least \$35,000 a year, and provide suitable residences for them in London, Paris, and Berlin. This should be done without waiting until Mr. BAYARD's successor is appointed, and Mr. BAYARD himself should be sent back from England, a poorer man, although not less widely esteemed and honored than when he went abroad.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

There must be no more victims. Congress, at the very next session, should raise the salaries of our principal Ambassadors to at least \$35,000 a year, and provide suitable residences for them in London, Paris, and Berlin. This should be done without waiting until Mr. BAYARD's successor is appointed, and Mr. BAYARD himself should be sent back from England, a poorer man, although not less widely esteemed and honored than when he went abroad.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

Mr. BAYARD's modest, manly, and disinterested statement should settle the matter at once. There is no answer to his presentation of the case. He is not complaining, although he can ill afford the draft upon his private resources which the rigid policy of our Government makes necessary. He is not asking for higher pay for himself. He is merely stating facts from the point of view of personal experience, in order that hereafter the nation's dignity may be suitably supported at the chief centres of European civilization, and that the statesmen whom we send thither to represent the United States may not be compelled to impoverish themselves.

## HAMMERSTEIN'S ACCUSATIONS.

Will Probably be Presented in Court Today in His Suit Against Koster & Ball.

Occur Hammerstein of Koster, Ball & Co. was closeted almost all day yesterday with Lawyer Steinhardt in the preparation of papers asking for a temporary injunction, with a motion that the injunction be made permanent, restraining Koster & Ball from transacting business in the music hall in West Thirty-fourth street, as well as from interfering with Hammerstein in his work as director and his interest as a partner. He asks for an accounting and permission to inspect the books at all times. Further, he begs that property which is not his be restored to him, and that the